

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Proudler

The Examiner rejects Claims 12-13, 15, 16 and 20 as being anticipated by Proudler (European Patent Application EP 0740482A1). The Examiner asserts that Proudler teaches a cordless communication system having a read/write unit within a base station and software implemented in the base station, as defined in independent Claim 20. Applicant respectfully submits that Proudler does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent Claims 12 and 20. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 12-13, 15, 16 and 20 are not anticipated by Proudler.

Proudler teaches a telephone management system that is very different from the cordless communication system defined in Claim 20. For example, instead of a cordless communication system that fulfills the same functions and tasks as the HLR and the AUC, Proudler's system has a call management processor 26 that routes incoming calls to either a cellular phone 14 operating at a cellular phone base station 12, or a cordless phone 36 operating at a cordless phone base station 34. As the present specification describes on page 2, lines 21-26, the cordless communication system takes over the functions of a base station of a mobile communication network, i.e., the functions of an HLR and an AUC. In fact, Applicant submits that Proudler's cellular phone 14, cordless phone 36, and respective base stations 12, 34 operate independently and separately from each other, and that, therefore, no "take over" occurs.

In view of Proudler's routing system, Applicant submits that Proudler fails to disclose or suggest further limitations recited in Claim 20 because the routing system does not need the functionality represented by the claim limitations. For example, Proudler fails to disclose a read/write unit within the base station of a cordless communication system that reads and writes information from and to, respectively, at least one identification module, wherein sections of data on the identification module used in the base station are identical to sections of data on a chip card of an access-authorized mobile terminal. Instead, Proudler only discloses that the base station 12 of the cellular phone 14 includes a SIM carrier 18.

Appl. No. : 09/380,412
Filed : August 30, 1999

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20 includes additional limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Proudler. The foregoing comments apply, mutatis mutandis, to the method defined in Claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 12 and 20 and to pass Claims 12 and 20 to allowance.

Claims 13-19 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and further define the invention defined in Claim 12. Claims 21-22 depend from Claim 20 and further define the invention defined in Claim 20. Thus, for the reasons set forth above and because of the additional inventive features recited in Claims 13-19 and 21-22, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13-19 and 21-22 are patentably distinguished over Proudler. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 13-19 and 21-22, and to pass Claims 13-19 and 21-22 to allowance.

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejects dependent Claims 14 and 17-19 as being unpatentable over Proudler in view of Vu (U.S. Patent No 6,156,436), and dependent Claim 22 as being unpatentable over Proudler. These claims depend from patentable independent claims as discussed above. Thus, for this reason alone, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14, 17-19 and 22 are patentably distinguished over Proudler or a combination of Proudler and Vu.

In addition, Vu teaches a communication system handset which can be operated with different subscriber identity modules (SIMs). The SIMs are stored in a plurality of slots inside of the handset, and the user can switch between the individual SIMs to choose between different subscribers. Vu does not disclose or suggest a cordless communication system that fulfills the same functions and tasks as the HLR and the AUC as does Applicant's inventive embodiments. Applicant submits that even if one of ordinary skill in the pertinent technology would combine Proudler and Vu, such a combination would not render the subject matter of Claims 12 and 20 obvious.

Appl. No. : 69/380,412
Filed : August 30, 1999

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14, 17-19 and 22 are patentably distinguished over Proudler or a combination of Proudler and Vu. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections and to pass Claims 14, 17-19 and 22 to allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/16/01

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 235-8550

H:\DOCS\MOH\MOH-6415.DOC:ad
111201